

# THE BOSTON MORNING POST.

PUBLISHED DAILY, AT NO. 21 WATER STREET, BY BEALS & GREENE.—CHARLES GORDON GREENE, EDITOR.

PRICE \$6 PER ANN. IN ADVANCE.

MONDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 16, 1835.

VOLUME IX. NO. 142.

## DEMOCRATIC NOMINATIONS.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
**MARTIN VAN BUREN.**  
FOR VICE PRESIDENT,  
**RICHARD M. JOHNSON.**

**MR. A. H. EVERETT'S SPEECH,**  
AT THE MEETING AT FANEUIL HALL, ON SUNDAY EVENING, NOV. 8.

Rise, Mr. Chairman, with more than usual diffidence to address through you, this large and most respectable assembly, in support of the resolutions which have just been offered. For obvious reasons which will occur to you, I should have much preferred the attitude of a listener and a silent voter. But I feel myself imperiously called on to say a few words in self defence. For two or three weeks past my political conduct and character have been attacked in certain newspapers with extraordinary acrimony. In some of the recent debates in the House of Representatives, I found myself pointedly denounced by members with whom I have often had the pleasure on other occasions of concurring in opinion, and in this very hall, two or three days ago, at a meeting similar in character to this, a gentleman, whom I have hitherto been happy to consider as a political and personal friend, alluded to me in terms which seem to require some notice. It cannot, I think, be deemed inappropriate to say a few words in reply, in the place where the attack has been most publicly made. I am aware of the extreme delicacy of the topic, but I am compelled by the violence of others, to throw myself upon the indulgence of my fellow citizens. I will be as brief as possible, and will afterwards add a few observations more directly upon the subject before the meeting.

Before I say any thing upon the justice of these attacks, permit me, however, Mr. Chairman, to remark by way of preface, that I would not wish to be regarded as particularly sensitive to the unceremonious form in which they are made. I am well aware of the licence that belongs to the period of the annual election—our political saturnalia; and have no objection to taking my share of the abuse, which at that time is poured from one quarter or another, upon all who are in any manner, however humble, concerned in the contest. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, such of us as have the misfortune to be candidates, have, perhaps, good reason to be grateful that we meet with nothing worse than hard words. Some years ago, when I was in England, I recollect being present at an election at Westminster, when one of the candidates, a gallant officer in the navy, was pelted like a man in the pillory, and hurt so much, that he was compelled to keep house for several days. My friends of the daily press, who do not appear to want the will to do mischief, have not yet resorted to arguments of this sort. "As to mere hard words, I cannot say that they greatly affect me. As the fish-woman said of the eels she was flaying alive, I am used to them. I have had more or less of this sort of abuse for twenty years past, and I do not perceive that I have lost flesh upon it. I must say, however, Mr. Chairman, as the occasion presents itself, that the tone of the articles to which I allude, resembles much more that of a fishwoman, than that of gentlemen, who even in the midst of political differences, know how to respect themselves and others.

But to come more nearly to the merits of the case. The statements which have been made respecting me, are as incorrect in the particulars, as they are unjust in the spirit and substance. I hold in my hand the Atlas of Monday last, in which I am singled out by name, as the subject of about three columns of gross invective, including charges of selfishness, tergiversation, corruption, treachery, venality, and I know not how many more high crimes and misdemeanors. The whole indictment, Mr. Chairman, as far as it has any appearance of support, rests upon two or three short statements of facts, the correctness of which, I will briefly examine. The first is as follows:

"Mr. Alexander H. Everett introduced a vote, (meaning probably made a motion) into the House at the present session, striking at the whole Banking system, intended to prostrate at a blow, the entire system of State Banks."

Such is the statement; now sir, how stands the fact? The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Alexander H. Everett made no motion, whatever, good or bad, either at the late or any former session of the legislature, upon the subject of banks. So much for the correctness of the Atlas. At the winter session of the present legislature, I supported the report of the committee on banks, and banking, which recommended that no more banks should be chartered. This report was adopted by a great majority. On that occasion I made a few remarks, which have since been printed, and from which, the public are able to judge whether my views of this subject, are as incorrect as they are here reported to be. In the committee of revisions, I made a motion, tending not to subvert the banking business, that is, the business of lending money, but to withdraw from banks the privilege which they now enjoy, of issuing paper money, and to place them in this respect, on the same footing with other corporations and individuals. This is probably the motion alluded to by the Atlas. Whether, living, as we do, under a constitution which declares that no men, or body of men shall enjoy any exclusive privileges, this proposition was so very heretical as the Atlas is pleased to represent it, I will not at present inquire; suffice it to say, that whether heretical or not, it was merely thrown out in the Committee, and was never moved in the Legislature.

So much for the correctness of one statement. I proceed to examine another:

"Mr. Everett sustained throughout the session the measures of Mr. Rantoul and Mr. Robinson."

How stands the fact in regard to this? The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that as far as my recollection extends, I have not, either at the for-

mer or present session of the legislature, supported any motion made by Mr. Robinson, or more than one of any importance made by Mr. Rantoul. The two principal measures of the latter gentleman, the abolition of corporations and of capital punishment, I actively opposed. The measure on which I supported him, was the abolition of the bar rules. This was moved by him as a sort of compromise. It was so considered by the House, and was accepted by a majority of more than three to one, the vote having stood, if I recollect rightly, 180 to 56. I was one of that majority, and I was not one of those members to the number, I believe of not less than sixty or seventy, who the very next day, in the language of Lord Castlereagh, turned their backs upon themselves, and marched right up to the negative of the same proposition which they had voted for before.

In contradicting the statement, that I supported through the session, the measures of Mr. Robinson and Mr. Rantoul, I wish to be distinctly understood, Mr. Chairman, as intending no disparagement or disrespect to either of those gentlemen. My feeling towards both, is of a friendly, I may almost say grateful character. I found in both, as members of the House, a sympathy and concurrence in the support of liberal measures, in whatever quarter they might have originated, which I often regretted not to find in professed political friends. I thought them much better entitled, by the principles they professed, and the measures they supported, to the name of whigs, than some of those who claimed it as a party appellation. I contradict the statement simply because it gives a false view of my political course. It represents me, for an invidious purpose, as following the lead of certain individuals, when in fact I have always acted according to my own independent judgment upon the merits of every question that came before the House.

So much, however, for the correctness of these two statements, and I remark, Mr. Chairman, that these are the only two attempts to specify facts in support of the vague charges of corruption and treachery, that are made against me in this paper. I proceed to another assertion of a different character.

"It was directly charged upon Mr. Everett in the House on Friday afternoon by Mr. Clifford, the able and spirited whig Representative from New Bedford, that no reasonable or reasonable man could suppose for a moment that he had adopted his recent course from any other than corrupt motives."

Now, it so happens, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Clifford of New Bedford, is a gentleman with whom I have the pleasure of being in habits of the most friendly intercourse. Of the new relations into which I have been brought by the seat which I have had the honor to occupy in the General Court, I hardly recollect any one more agreeable to me, than that which I have formed with him. Any remark of the kind here imputed to him is as utterly foreign to the feeling habitually prevalent between us as it is to truth and justice. The morning after these paragraphs appeared, when I went to the House of Representatives, the first person whom I accosted was Mr. Clifford, who was writing at the table, and who informed me, with expressions of surprise and disgust at the language imputed to him, that he was at that moment writing a letter to the editor of the Atlas, for the purpose of disavowing it. Now, sir, if there be any thing in which a generous mind takes more delight than in all others, it is in repairing an injury. If the writers in the Atlas had possessed a spark of good feeling, or the least regard for common honesty, they would have hastened to withdraw the offensive language, and to make the *amende honorable* to me. What was their course?—The following day they published a sort of lame apology for their misrepresentations as far as Mr. Clifford was concerned, and in regard to me they took the occasion to pour out a new flood of malignity and falsehood.

Before I leave this paper, I will briefly allude to one more point which is of too private a character to enlarge upon.

"Mr. Edward Everett and Mr. Alexander H. Everett have no community of political feeling, and on all national subjects they are as far as the poles asunder. There has been no political communication, as far as we can learn, between them for a year or two."

Sir, if the polluted souls who dabble in the filth of this scurrilous journal, could for a moment form a conception of the sacredness and beauty of the relations of private life, they would have shrunk from the thought of interfering for mere momentary political effect, with a friendship like that which has always existed between my brother and me. I will not condescend to examine or enlarge upon the base insinuation that there is a misunderstanding between us. I content myself with giving it a direct and flat denial. Hardly a week, I might almost say a day, has passed, since my return from Europe, in which there has not been some communication, either personal or in writing, between us, on political and all other subjects in which we have a common interest.

So much, Mr. Chairman, for the correctness in the particulars of the charges that have been made against me: and here I might with safety rest my defence, leaving it to my opponents, if they think proper, to re-state the accusation in a form in which it might have at least the appearance of plausibility. But, Sir, I am not disposed to rest here. I go farther, and waving all exceptions to the form in which these charges are made, to the gross errors in fact which are mixed up with them, to the malignant tone in which they are urged, I prefer to come directly to the merits of the case. What then appears to be the real difficulty?

The substantial charge which is concealed under this cloud of calumny,—the foundation in fact, if there be any, for this tissue of malignant representations, is, as far as I can understand it, Mr. Chairman,—that I have taken the liberal side on several questions that have successively come before the House of Representatives.

This, Mr. Chairman, seems to be the head and front of my offending, and to this charge, thus reduced to its proper shape, I with perfect cheerfulness plead guilty. It is strictly true, that on several important questions that have successively come before the Legislature in this and the preceding years, since I have been a member, I have taken the popular side. It is not true, however, Sir, as I have already said, that in taking this course I have supported the measures of Mr. Robinson, Mr. Rantoul, or Mr. Any-body-else. No, Sir, I have supported such measures as tended, in my opinion, to secure the rights and promote the welfare of the people, without regard to the quarter in which they were moved. I supported the Abolition of Imprisonment for Debt. Was this one of the measures of Mr. Robinson or of Mr. Rantoul? No, Sir, it was ably supported by both those gentlemen, but it was considered as peculiarly in charge of my friend Mr. Blake, whose generous, persevering and successful exertions in support of it, entitled him to the lasting gratitude of the friends of humanity. I supported the freedom of Warren Bridge. This is another of my offences. But was this one of the measures of Messrs. Robinson and Rantoul? Sir, it was ably supported by both those gentlemen, but the persons who took the lead in it were Mr. Thompson of Charlestown, and Mr. Keyes of Concord, both members of the Whig Central Committee. I supported the suspension of any further augmentation of banking capital, and in the Committee of Revision I was in favor of withdrawing from the Banks the privilege which they now enjoy of issuing paper money. Were these the measures of Messrs. Robinson and Rantoul? Sir, the former was recommended at two successive sessions by the Committee on Banks and Banking, and passed at both by large majorities. The other I moved myself in the Committee of Revision, of which Mr. Robinson was not a member, and it did not obtain the vote of Mr. Rantoul. I supported the motion to strike out the numerous exemptions from service in the militia, which have gradually brought the whole institution into disrepute. Was this the measure of Mr. Rantoul or Mr. Robinson?—No, Sir, it was moved by my friend, Colonel Bigelow. Finally, I supported the motion for a reform in the mode of admission to the Bar. This measure was in fact moved by Mr. Robinson, and presented in an amended form by Mr. Rantoul. But was I to oppose a measure which I really approved, because it came from gentlemen with whom I have not generally acted upon the questions which of late years have divided political parties? I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, that such appeared to me to be the moving consideration with a large number of members, who, as I have said before, after voting for the measure one day, voted against it the day after. They seemed to apprehend that by allowing the measure to pass, they should strengthen the political party of the gentlemen that moved it, and therefore, finally rejected it; although they had once shewn by their votes, that they believed it to be a good measure. Sir, these are not my principles of action. This is the very thing that my opponents falsely impute to me as a crime. Sir, I cannot support or reject a measure, nor can I support a measure one day and reject it the next, merely for political effect. If I believe a measure to be good, I vote for it: if I believe it to be bad, I vote against it, without inquiring in either case, who moved it, or what effect it will have on the mutual relations of political parties.

The course of certain members of the House respecting this matter reminded me, Mr. Chairman, of an anecdote which I took the liberty of relating in the House and which, as it happens to be a short one, I will venture to repeat here. It describes a fact which is said to have occurred at one of the Greek assemblies of the people:—at Thebes, at Athens, or the Lord knows where? But, Sir, in one of the old cradles of liberty of former days not more celebrated now than old Faneuil Hall will be two thousand years hence,—a citizen who did not happen to be in the majority and was of course unpopular with those who were,—one of the Rantouls and Robinsons of that day and place, rose to make a motion. Another citizen of more weight, one of the leaders of the dominant political party, who sat near him, got a hint of what he was going to say before he had proceeded far, and said to him, clapping him on the shoulder at the time in a familiar way,—Stop! Stop! my friend! that is too good a motion to come from you. Sit you down and I will make that motion myself."

Sir, a similar remark was made in almost the same words in reference to this very subject of the Bar Rules in the House of Representatives. Mr. Robinson originally moved the subject and accompanied his motion with some rather severe censures upon the character of the Bench and the Bar. Mr. Rantoul afterwards moved a reference to a committee. When after some debate the question was about to be taken upon this motion, a leading member of the legal profession and of the Whig party, rose and said that he hoped the motion would be voted down. He thought that the effect of adopting a motion, however good in itself, which had been brought before the House in such a manner, would be exceedingly bad. But, said he, if this motion is rejected, I pledge myself to renew it immediately after, and I hope that it will then pass by general consent!

And these, Mr. Chairman, are the gentlemen who accuse me of looking to political effect. Sir, my real offence is exactly the reverse: it is that I have not looked to political effect: that I have supported measures which I believed to be good, even when they came from gentlemen with whom I have not been in the habit of acting on party questions:—in short, Sir, that I have steered an independent course. If this be a crime, Mr. Chairman, I can only say that it is one which I am not disposed to repent of or to reform. It was a remark of one of the ancients that he liked Plato very much, but that he liked the truth still more. Sir, I re-

spect our High and Mighty Lords of the Whig Nominating Convention: I bow to the majesty of the People. But if the Nominating Convention or my constituents wish for my services upon any other footing than that of an entirely independent course on my part, I can only regret that it is not in my power to offer them on such conditions. In or out of the General Court, I shall always do what I believe to be right, and let the consequences take care of themselves.

But, Mr. Chairman, to the charge of taking the liberal side on various questions that have successively come before the General Court, since I have been a member of it, I have no hesitation, as I said before, in pleading guilty. If this be treason, let my opponents make the most of it: Attempts have been made, to fasten upon me, on this ground, the imputation of political inconsistency. Sir, those who make these attempts know that the imputation is false. They know that from my first entrance into political life, twenty years ago, up to the present time, I have constantly professed and acted upon the principles of the Democratic school of politics. Between the two great parties that have for half a century divided this country and all other parts of the civilized world, one aiming at Reform, Improvement, Liberty; the other at the preservation of existing institutions with all their abuses, I have never hesitated a moment. I glory in belonging to the party of Liberty,—to the party of the People. My first feeble efforts, made in the ardour of inexperienced youth, were in defence of the liberal principles involved in the questions at issue between this country and Great Britain, in the war of 1812. The labors of the riper years, which I spent abroad in the service of the country, were directed to the same end. Since my return from Europe, I have uniformly acted on the same principles; and as I am now too far advanced to expect any great accession of new light upon any subject, I have little doubt that I shall abide by this creed for the rest of my life.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the charge of political inconsistency, which certain persons in and out of the General Court, have sought to fasten upon me, is without foundation. I go farther, sir, I retort the charge upon those who make it. I ask them how they reconcile it with their political faith and profession as Whigs, to oppose those measures which I am charged with inconsistency for supporting. Is not a Whig, as such an adherent of liberal principles of government? Is he not a partizan of Reform, of Improvement, of Liberty? Were the great and glorious English Whigs, of ancient and of modern times, the adherents of arbitrary power? Did Hampden fall in the cause of the Prerogative? Did Sidney bleed upon the scaffold a martyr to loyalty? Were the Burkes, the Broughams, the Foxes, the Macintoshes, apostles of Aristocracy? Is it the effort of the British Whigs of the present day, in the great struggle in which they are now engaged, to arrest the progress of political improvement and keep things exactly where they were five hundred years ago? Sir, these questions answer themselves in the negative. A Whig, as we all know, is or ought to be, as such, an adherent of liberal political principles, a friend of reform, an enemy of existing abuses. A Whig in this Commonwealth is bound as such to support the abolition of Imprisonment for Debt,—the reform of the bar rules, the freedom of the bridges,—the removal of monopolies, exemptions and exclusive privileges. But what has been the course of some of our professed Whigs during the present session of the Legislature? Sir, they opposed all these measures, even when they were moved by members of their own political connexion? They resisted Imprisonment for Debt:—they fought like lions for the toll on Warren Bridge:—they resisted the reform of the Bar Rules:—they sustained the existing monopolies, exemptions and privileges:—but, Sir, what is the most amusing part of the affair, they now denounce me for taking the liberal side upon all these questions as—what, Mr. Chairman? You would naturally suppose as a Radical. This is the term which a person who was inclined to take an uncharitable view of the matter and knew how to preserve an appearance of consistency in his language, would probably use. No, Sir, they denounce me for having taken as they think a too liberal course, not as a Radical, but as a Tory! Sir, it is literally true, that for taking a liberal,—if you please, an ultra-liberal course in these questions, gentlemen in and out of the General Court, who would be very much offended if they were not supposed to be well versed both in political science and in the use of language, have denounced me as a Tory!

Yes, Sir, in this very hall, on Friday evening last, a gentleman, whom I have been accustomed to consider as a political and personal friend, one upon whose name the merits of others have shed a two-fold glory\*—if his remarks are correctly reported—represented me under the character of the most *persuadable* Whig he ever knew, as having become a Tory.

Mr. Chairman, this is really too ridiculous. That gentleman's father, who knew how to make the two ends of a sentence match, would never have uttered such a remark. So *persuadable* as that gentleman may think me, it will take more than his eloquence to persuade me, or the People, that the support of liberal measures, constitutes Toryism. But, Sir, if I am to establish my claim to the character of Whig, by opposing liberal measures, I must be content to remain a Tory after that gentleman's fashion, for the rest of my life. The gentleman is represented as intimating that he had no wish to persuade me back into the Whig ranks—in other words, that he was glad to get rid of me. Sir, I admire the gentleman's candor, even more than his politeness: and if he is satisfied, I do not know that I have any great reason to complain. But, sir, if he had any wish to remain politically associated with me, which it seems he has

not, I could point out to him an easier process than that of persuading me out of the support of liberal measures and principles. Let him act himself up to the name of Whig, which he assumes. Let him profess true Whig principles, and support true Whig measures: Let him join us in abolishing imprisonment for Debt, and giving freedom to Warren Bridge, and he will find me, Sir, without the trouble of persuasion, acting in concert with him.

So much, Mr. Chairman, in the way of self-defence. I owe an apology to the meeting, for occupying their time with matters in some degree personal to myself: but my principal object in rising was, as I remarked, to repel the attacks that had been made upon me in several quarters. While I am up, I will add a few words upon the subject of the Resolutions.

We are told by some that the Bridge Question is settled. Sir this is mere dust thrown into the eyes of the people for political effect. The question settled? Mr. Chairman, the question is now for the first time referred to the decision of the People. The People are now to decide whether Boston and Charles-town will or will not give the bond required by the act. Is this a time for the friends of a free bridge to remit their exertions? The proprietors of Charles River Bridge will infallibly resist the proposition to give the bond. They are already filling the newspapers with communications to this effect. I heard one of them say myself that he would not give the bond if you would pay him half a million of dollars. Mr. Dexter in his speech in the Senate sneered at the idea. Mr. Chairman, the friends of the freedom of Warren Bridge will be obliged to carry this point as they have carried every other—by unwearied labor and indefatigable perseverance. The first device of the enemy has been to attempt to lay us asleep by telling us that the question is settled. Sir, they will find themselves mistaken. We are wide awake. We must carry this matter into all the elections. We must begin to-morrow by placing in the General Court, men who will meet the question there in a proper manner, if it should come there again. We must then take care that a proper spirit is infused into the City Government, where reform of all kinds is greatly wanted. We must hold public meetings to concentrate and express the sentiments of the people. In short, Mr. Chairman, the question instead of being settled, is just in the state in which it requires the popular action, and Sir, permit me to add, it is a question far more important to the immediate practical welfare of this community, than the question who shall be the next President of the United States.

Again: How stands the matter of Imprisonment for Debt? The exploded and abolished law upon this subject has been by the pertinacity of the lawyers in the Legislature, partially revived. The Executive was prepared to negative the odious enactment, but the same influence which had effected its restoration was exercised with a violence which I have never seen equalled in the Legislature, to deprive the Lieutenant Governor of his undoubted constitutional right. Never, Mr. Chairman, have I witnessed such a scene as was exhibited on this occasion in the House of Representatives. In a former debate, a member had thrown out some rather disparaging remarks upon the character of the Judiciary and the Bar. They were immediately repelled with a burst of indignation from all quarters, and for the rest of the session we never heard the last of that matter. But Sir, when the lawyers themselves found it convenient to attack another branch of the government, the case was quite different. They would not even permit a reply. In both the debates on this subject, after the most violent speeches had been made,—speeches in which the Lieutenant Governor was compared to the worst tyrants and usurpers,—before any thing could be said in his defence, the previous question was called for and the debate was stopped. On one of these occasions, Mr. Chairman, I attempted myself, as I had a perfect right to do, to introduce a few observations in defence of the Executive, under the form of remarks upon the propriety of putting the previous question. Before I could finish the first sentence I was interrupted by the member who had fulminated the denunciation to which I was replying; and although I was undoubtedly in order,—although I insisted till I was ashamed to insist any longer,—the chair refused to sustain me on the floor, and I found myself substantially silenced. Whether, after these unexampled scenes, the Lieut. Governor would not have done better to negative the whole code, leaving the responsibility to rest where it ought, is with me a quite doubtful question. He has probably done what he thought to be his duty. It now remains for us to do what we know to be ours:—to place in the General Court Representatives who will purge the Statute Book of this barbarous law.

Go forward, then, friends of humanity and freedom, to the Polls! Open once more the prison doors, which a selfish and savage policy—I can give it no better name,—has again closed upon the unfortunate debtor! Restore him to his desolate home! to his agonized family! Destitute as he is, let him at least breathe the free air of heaven! Let him at least enjoy the satisfaction of laboring for his wife and children! Humanity invites, conjures, commands you to go to his relief. She entreates you in the charming language of the first of poets to temper justice with mercy. Let me recollect to your remembrance her heavenly accents and may they penetrate your hearts

The quality of mercy is not strained;  
It droppeth like the gentle rain from Heaven  
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blessed;  
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.  
The mightiest monarch better than his crown.  
His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,  
The attribute and awe of majesty,  
In which do sit the dread and fear of Kings;  
But mercy is above this sceptred sway;  
It is enthroned in the hearts of Kings;  
It is the attribute of God himself;  
And earthy power doth then show likest God,  
When Mercy seasons Justice.—

\* Hon. Franklin Dexter, son of Samuel Dexter.



*It is a remarkable Success.*—Mr Brooks, the Foreign correspondent of a Portland paper, has been *putted on* *shoulder by an Englishman who had R. N.* *marked on his trunk ! ! !*

the New Orleans "Union" states the amount of the Capital in the State of Louisiana to be nearly forty-nine millions of dollars, of which twenty millions are paid in.

---

**Phrenology.**—The Buffalo Star denounces the fraternalism of Mr. Thomas Stn., a lecturer on Phrenology, in whose head the bump of *unpatriotism* is largely developed.

his workmen settle, the cost being five times  
that of the disputed sum. In reply, the witness  
said: "I told the f-o-o-o-a to s-s-s-settle; I  
and the c-o-n-stable would t-t-t-take their c-o-  
-st-the l-l-l-lawyers their s-s-s-shirts, and if they  
-your Honor's court you'd s-s-s-skin 'em."

Flower, Salem  
 on, Springer, Ala. natu.  
 , Park North Star, Havana, Oct 1.  
**CLEARED.**  
 minor, Speller, Batavia and Canton; Tanguis, Moo  
 ; Arga, Parley, Savannah; Parks L. Grange, Shuy  
 Islands; Sagamore, Knight, New Orleans; briz  
 field, Cape Town, Cape Town, Cape of Good Hope  
 nes, Tecumseh; Dora, Holmes, Trieste; Tom  
 Hancock, St Croix; Roderic Dhu, Kendrick, Port  
 Reclus, White

No. 7 Congress street.  
STOCKS, GLOVES,  
HOSIERY, & SUSPENDERS,  
Gentlemen's ready made Linen,  
the fabric and best workmanship, to be sold by  
DARWIN CHAFFIN  
No 20 Washington St.  
ED.—Several young men to travel as Agents







NATHANIEL GREENE, *Postmaster*